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Adapting to Horizon 2020

• New types of call → new types of proposal
  • **multi-disciplinary** and multi-sectorial;
  • more emphasis on innovation and **close-to-market**;
ECHOUTCOME is a European platform aiming to assess methodological properties of Healthcare Outcome and Cost-Benefit studies. ECHOUTCOME consortium, eight partners-four countries, aims to study European health systems for assessing decision making criteria in the frame of national needs and expectations across EU states concerning healthcare outcomes and cost-benefit analyses. ECHOUTCOME will investigate relationships between quality of care, costs, efficiency by assessing usual approaches and developing new ones. It considers properties and consequences of published guidances (ex: QALY from NICE), which lead to requirements for access to health technologies for further recommendation to EU states.
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The ECHOUTCOME consortium is composed by eight partners from 4 countries including:

- 3 academic international experts in Outcome Research from,
- The French Scientific Society in Health Economics
- The European office of one Multinational BioPharma industry,
- 2 research organisations (SME) specialized in advanced statistics and modelling
- 1 organization specialized in international research administration.
65,000 aortic valve replacements (AVR) are performed in Europe each year to treat acquired and congenital aortic valve diseases. In affected patients, mortality without AVR is extremely high and 50% die within 2 years. Current AVR options are, however, limited for young patients - especially female patients - and those unwilling to accept life-long medical anticoagulation with its inherent risks. None of the currently available prostheses for AVR is tailored toward the individual patient or allows for individual regeneration. The ARISE project will bridge this therapeutic gap in a Phase II clinical study to determine the feasibility, safety and efficacy of regenerative heart valves for aortic valve replacement.

The ARISE consortium will address these challenges, integrating a network of seven leading centres for cardio-thoracic surgery (3 research centers and 4 universities), and a hospital each with proven track records in clinical research, an innovative SME experienced in bringing human tissue products to the clinic and market and expertise in ethical and regulatory aspects of regenerative medicine.
Eligibility check made by EC

- **EU Commission will check your proposal for eligibility** (against general eligibility criteria set out in General Annexes A and C to the work programme and specific eligibility conditions set out in the work programme for your call).

**Example:**
Research & innovation actions require, for instance, a minimum of three independent legal entities established in different Member States or associated countries.

- **Specific cases:**
  In the case of two-stage submission schemes, an eligibility check is carried out at first stage. At second stage, we will check that the eligibility conditions are still complied with.
Evaluation of proposals

- **EC** chooses its experts
- **Experts** evaluates your proposal
- **EC** establishes its ranked list
Ethics pre-screening and ethics review

- In parallel to the evaluation, EC will check if your proposal **complies with ethical principles and relevant legislation.**
EC Chooses its experts

• How are the evaluators selected?

• Looking at **keywords specified in your proposal.**
• High level of **skills, experience and knowledge in the relevant areas** *(e.g. field, project management, innovation, exploitation, dissemination and communication)*;
• Provided the above condition can be satisfied, a **balance in terms of:**
  • skills, experience and knowledge;
  • geographical diversity;
  • **gender**;
  • where appropriate, the private and public sectors
EC Chooses its experts

- At least **three independent experts** per proposal (but can be more depending on WP).
  
  *Exception:* For the first stage in two-stage submission schemes and for low-value grants, it may be that only two experts are used.

- Additional experts appointed for **ethics review**.

- The evaluation process might be followed by one or more **independent observers**.
Conflict of interest

Is considered a conflict of interest exists, if an expert:

• was involved in the preparation of a proposal;
• benefits directly or indirectly if a proposal is accepted;
• has a close family or personal relationship with any person representing an applicant;
• is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant;
• is employed or contracted by one of the applicants or any named subcontractors;
• is a member of an advisory group set up by the Commission to advise on the preparation of EU or Euratom Horizon 2020 work programmes or work programmes in an area related to the call;
• is a National Contact Point or is directly working for the Enterprise Europe Network;
• is a member of a programme committee;
• for Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions: is acting as a referee of the applicant.
Think as you were an evaluator when writing the proposal
On what do the evaluators focus?

**Award criteria**

- **Criterion 1: Excellence**
  - Clarity and Pertinence of the Objectives
  - Credibility of the proposed approach
  - Soundness of the Concept
  - Ambition and State of the Art.

- **Criterion 2: Impact**
  - The expected impacts listed in the work plan
  - Enhancing Innovation Capacity
  - Strengthening Competitiveness
  - Any other Environmental
  - Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit, disseminate etc

- **Criterion 3: Implementation**
  - Coherence and Effectiveness of the Work plan
  - Complementarity
  - Appropriateness of Structures
Scoring/weights/thresholds

• Each criterion scored out of 5 (max 15)
• Proposal threshold of 10/12 (out of 15)
• Individual criterion threshold of 3.

• Unlike FP7, for Innovation Actions, Fast Track to Innovation and SME instrument...
  • impact criterion weighted by factor of 1.5
  • Impact considered first when scores equal
Evaluation process phases

• Phase 1 — Individual evaluation
• Phase 2 — Consensus group
• Phase 3 — Panel review
Evaluation Process
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Individual Evaluation Report
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Eligible proposal

Minimum 3 experts
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Consensus
Priority of proposals with equal score

• For each group of tied proposals

1. First consider those that "fill gaps" in the WP/topic
2. Of those, look at score for 'excellence', then at score for 'impact' (reverse for Innovation actions & SME instrument)
3. If still equal, look at SME budget
4. If still equal look at gender balance in key personnel
5. If still equal, consider other factors (overall portfolio, wider H2020, EU objectives etc)
Useful links

• Grant Manual – Section on: proposal submission and evaluation

• Lists of H2020 expert evaluators in SC1 2014 calls

• H2020 Manual - Working as an expert
  http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/experts/experts_en.htm
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